

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

|                                  |   |                           |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Nathaniel Bailey,                | ) |                           |
|                                  | ) |                           |
|                                  | ) |                           |
| Petitioner,                      | ) | C/A No. 6:06-1786-DCN-WMC |
|                                  | ) |                           |
| v.                               | ) |                           |
|                                  | ) | <b>ORDER</b>              |
| Edward F. Reilly, Chairman; U.S. | ) |                           |
| Parole Commission; and Warden of | ) |                           |
| FCI Bennettsville,               | ) |                           |
|                                  | ) |                           |
| Respondents.                     | ) |                           |
|                                  | ) |                           |

The above referenced case is before this court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that respondents' motion for summary judgment be granted.

This court must conduct a de novo review of any portion or portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") to which an objection is made, and may accept, reject, or modify the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, this court need not review any findings or recommendations to which neither party objects. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). A party's failure to object constitutes an acceptance of the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984) (adopting interpretation of 28 U.S.C. § 636 which conditions appeal from district court's judgment on magistrate judge's recommendation on party's filing of objects with the district court); Thomas, 474 U.S. at 155 (upholding similar procedural rules). A general objection that is not "sufficiently specific to focus the district court's attention on the factual and legal issues that are truly in dispute" is inadequate to obtain district court review. Page v. Lee,

337 F.3d 411, 416 n.3 (4th Cir. 2003) (quoting United States v. 2121 E. 30th Street, 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996)).

On February 26, 2007 petitioner filed a motion entitled “Motion for Reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge’s Ruling Pursuant to F.R. Civ. P. 72(b).” In his motion, petitioner makes only a general request that this court reconsider the magistrate judge’s Report. This motion does not object to any specific finding of the magistrate judge, and is therefore insufficient to obtain review.

Even considering the motion, it provides no basis to disturb the Report’s analysis. A de novo review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge’s Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation is affirmed, and respondents’ motion for summary judgment is granted.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

**David C. Norton**  
**United States District Judge**

**Charleston, South Carolina**  
**March 15, 2007**

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30) days** from the date hereof pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.